



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/780,286	02/17/2004	Masashi Miyazaki	02008/150001	7081
7590	06/06/2005			EXAMINER WACHSMAN, HAL D
Jonathan P. Osha ROSENTHAL & OSCHA L.L.P. Suite 2800 1221 McKinney Houston, TX 77010			ART UNIT 2857	PAPER NUMBER
DATE MAILED: 06/06/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/780,286	MIYAZAKI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hal D. Wachsman	2857	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 2 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 February 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 03 November 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

1. This application is in condition for allowance except for the following formal matters:

- a) The substitute drawings filed 11-3-04 are objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.121 because the drawing sheets were not labeled in the top margin as "Replacement Sheet". Appropriate correction is required.
- b) PALM indicates a preliminary amendment to the claims dated 2-17-04 however there is no such preliminary amendment to the claims in the image file wrapper for the application. The Examiner would like to confirm with the Applicant whether or not the above PALM record is in error. If it is not in error, then the Applicant is respectfully requested to re-submit a copy of that preliminary amendment.
- c) The Abstract is objected to because it is greater than 150 words in length and contains legal phraseology (i.e. "enable signal controlling *means*", "setting *means*", etc.). In addition, the Abstract states "..onto which different types of testing modules are optionally mounted.." however by using the word "optionally" here that implies that there may or may not be testing modules in the testing apparatus. This same type of problem also occurs in the specification such as on page 1 for example. Appropriate correction is required.
- d) The specification, claims and abstract are objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.52 because in various locations there is insufficient space between the words resulting in several words being connected together. For example, page 1, line 25, cites "controllingmodulessoastoarbitrarilyselectthetriggersignals" in which a number of words have been joined together. Appropriate correction is required.

e) Page 2, line 17, of the specification cites "capable of" which implies that the invention may or may not do what is being cited. Page 26, line 9, of the specification cites "...since no **management tale**..." but what exactly is meant by "management tale"? Appropriate correction is required.

f) Claims 1-9 are objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(a) for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Claim 1, line 4, cites "optionally mounted" however by using the word "optionally" here that implies that there may or may not be testing modules in the testing apparatus. Claim 1, line 12, cites "said controlling module" however the antecedent basis appears to be plural. Claim 1, line 13, cites "in response to said specific testing module" but in response to what from said specific testing module? This same type of problem also occurs in claim 1, lines 19-20. Claim 1, lines 14-15 and 16-17, cite "said testing module" however the antecedent basis appears to be "specific testing module".

This same type of problem also occurs at various other locations throughout the claims.
Claim 2, lines 1-2, cite "said controlling module" however the antecedent basis appears to be "specific controlling module". *This same type of problem also occurs at various other locations throughout the claims.* Claim 4, line 6, cites "said trigger signals" however the antecedent basis appears to be singular. Claim 5, line 6, cites "said clock signals" however the antecedent basis appears to be singular. Claim 9, line 1, cites "a control signal" however there is already antecedent basis for this in claim 1. The examiner asks the applicant to better claim the limitations cited above. While the

examiner understands the intentions of the applicant he feels confusion could be drawn from the limitations cited above. Appropriate correction is required.

Prosecution on the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for reply to this action is set to expire **TWO MONTHS** from the mailing date of this letter.

2. The following references are cited as being art of general interest: Barch et al. (6,101,457) which disclose a test access port for an integrated circuit having a test register and a controller, Ricchetti et al. (US 2003/0009715 A1) which disclose a parallel test architecture with a plurality of controllers, Wotzak et al. (5,638,383) which disclose an avionics testing system with module clock control and Cox et al. (5,777,873) which disclose a module under test being loaded into a test fixture and a test fixture controller.

3. Claims 1-9 are allowable over the prior art because the prior art does not disclose or suggest: hardware setting information being set in advance in a controlling module in order to send a control signal in response to a specific testing module that's mounted in a testing module slot; an enable signal controlling means for instructing the testing module to generate and supply an enable signal to the controlling module supplying a control signal to the testing module; and setting means for setting a specific controlling module of a plurality of controlling modules to supply the control signal in response to the specific testing module to the specific testing module based on the

hardware setting information, the specific controlling module receiving the enable signal from the specific testing module.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hal D. Wachsman whose telephone number is 571-272-2225. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 7:00 A.M. to 4:30 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marc Hoff can be reached on 571-272-2216. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Hal D Wachsman
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2857

HW
May 30, 2005